



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.                                                                         | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.               | CONFIRMATION NO.       |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|----------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------|
| 10/520,520                                                                              | 01/07/2005  | Hiroshisa Tanaka     | 71465.00011                       | 9264                   |
| 57362                                                                                   | 7590        | 11/18/2008           |                                   |                        |
| AKERMAN SENTERFITT<br>801 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE N.W.<br>SUITE 600<br>WASHINGTON, DC 20004 |             |                      | EXAMINER<br>D'ANIELLO, NICHOLAS P |                        |
|                                                                                         |             |                      | ART UNIT<br>1793                  | PAPER NUMBER           |
|                                                                                         |             |                      | MAIL DATE<br>11/18/2008           | DELIVERY MODE<br>PAPER |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Advisory Action  
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

**Application No.**

10/520,520

**Applicant(s)**

TANAKA ET AL.

**Examiner**

Nicholas P. D'Aniello

**Art Unit**

1793

**--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

THE REPLY FILED 03 November 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**NOTICE OF APPEAL**

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

**AMENDMENTS**

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).  
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.  
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.  
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  
Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) rejected: 1, 3-7 and 9-11.  
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

**AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE**

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).  
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).  
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER**

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See Continuation Sheet.  
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.  
13. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

/Jessica L. Ward/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1793

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Applicant arguments are not persuasive. Specifically:

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., the catalyst produced has noble metals that are supported on the perovskite-type composite oxide only) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Solely to clarify a misunderstanding on page 9 of the remarks, the mixture recited in the claim does not necessarily have to be pre-crystalline during the heat treatment; the claim only requires mixing the pre-crystalline composition of the perovskite-type oxide and noble metal with the alumina to form the mixture. In other words, this does not preclude a heating step prior to the heat treatment that would cause crystallization. It is noted that the claim recites "subjecting the mixture to heat treatment" and not subjecting the pre-crystallization mixture to heat treatment.

As noted in the previous rejection (see the response to arguments) Yoshiyuki does not contain a noble metal during the preparing of the pre-crystallization composition. However, as also previously asserted in the rejection, it would have been obvious to use a pre-crystalline composition including a noble metal with the perovskite type oxide because Kaneko et al. teach a similar method of making a catalyst where a noble metal is included with the un-crystallized perovskite-type oxide, and the method yields a durable catalyst for oxidizing atmospheres (see paragraph [0037 of Kaneko et al.).

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, Yoshiyuki et al. and Kaneko et al. both relate to methods of making catalysts for use in high temperature oxidizing applications and Kaneko et al. provide a motivation to use his teachings (i.e. to create a durable catalyst).

The inclusion of the noble metals with the perovskite-type oxide would not preclude one from coating with a noble metal such as in the method of Yoshiyuki et al. as asserted by applicant at the bottom of page 10 in the remarks. However, the inclusion of the noble metal during the preparing of the pre-crystallization compound makes the catalyst durable as disclosed by Kaneko et al.

In response to applicant's argument that the process of Yoshiyuki et al. is different than that of applicant, the fact that applicant has recognized another advantage which would flow naturally from following the suggestion of the prior art cannot be the basis for patentability when the differences would otherwise be obvious. See *Ex parte Obiaya*, 227 USPQ 58, 60 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1985).

In response to applicant's argument that Nogushi does not make up for the deficiencies and against the reference individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). The Nogushi reference is used solely to show that alpha alumina is most commonly used because it is the most thermally stable form of alumina, therefore the fact that Nogushi does not include a perovskite-type composite oxide containing a noble metal is inconsequential as the rejection is based on a combination of references.